

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested. In the present response, claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-15, 18, and 19 have been canceled, and claims 6, 9, 16, 17, and 20 have been amended. Claims 6, 9, 16, 17, and 20 remain pending in this application.

Formal matters

The specification has been objected to because of informalities on page 6 regarding references to Figures 3 and 4. In response, Applicant has amended page 6 of the specification in accordance with Examiner's suggestions.

Applicant has noticed that pages 9 and 12 of the specification include similar informalities in referring to Figure 3 and Figure 4. Accordingly, pages 9 and 12 of the specification have also been amended in order to correct those informalities.

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 USC 112(2) as being indefinite. In this regard, Examiner has specifically pointed out objectionable language in claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, and 16-18.

The formal objections/rejections regarding claims 1, 4, 8, 13, and 14 are moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of those claims. For claims 6, 9, and 16-18, Applicant's present amendments to those claims address all pertinent formal problems cited by Examiner. Moreover, to the extent that Applicant's amendments to claims 6, 9, 10, 15-17 and 20 incorporate limitations from claims 1, 4, and 6, any formal objections to the language that was originally present in claims 1, 4, and 6 are addressed by Applicant's present amendments (described in further detail below).

Substantive matters

Claims 1-5, 7, and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Huber (U.S. Patent 6,731,078). These rejections are moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of those claims.

Claims 1-5, 7-8, and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown (U.S. Patent 5,960,207). These rejections are moot in view of Applicant's cancellation

of those claims.

Claim 8 has been further rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Huber (U.S. Patent 6,731,078) in view of Brown (U.S. Patent 5,960,207). This rejection is moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of claim 8.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Huber (U.S. Patent 6,731,078) or Brown (U.S. Patent 5,960,207). This rejection is moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of claim 11.

Claims 6, 9-10, and 15-20 have been indicated as having allowable subject matter. More specifically, claims 6, 9-10, and 15-20 have been indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112(2) and to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response:

(1) Claims 6 and 9 have each been recast in independent form to substantially incorporate the limitations of claims 1 and 5. In the course of amending claims 6 and 9, Applicant has corrected any objectionable language that was originally present in claims 1, 5, 6, and 9. In particular, the language from claim 1 regarding "...as long as the system power supply is disconnected, a current path bridging the load inputs is created..." has been replaced with recitations which more clearly recite the intended claimed subject matter. Additionally, the language in claim 6 regarding "one system side-input of a rectifier" has been replaced with more definite language (i.e., "first input" and "second input"); claim 9 has been amended to delete any potentially confusing recitations regarding "short-circuit" and "upstream." Accordingly, claims 6 and 9 are now believed to be in a condition for allowance.

(2) Claim 10 has been canceled.

(3) Claim 15 has been canceled.

(4) Claims 16 and 17 (each of which depends directly on claim 6) have been amended to correct any formal issues, and in order to further clarify the language of those claims. In particular, claims 16 and 17 been amended to provide proper antecedence for, among other things, "the inductor" of the converter; claim 17 has also been amended to delete any potentially confusing recitations regarding "short-circuit" and "upstream." Accordingly, claims 16 and 17 are now believed to be in a condition for allowance.

(5) Claims 18 and 19 have been canceled.

(6) Claim 20 (which depends directly on claim 6) has been amended in order to clarify the language of the claim. Examiner has not asserted any formal issues with regard to the language of claim 20. Accordingly, claim 20 is now believed to be in a condition for allowance.

Thus, claims 6, 9, 16, 17, and 20 are now believed to be in a condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, passing of this case is now in order. Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's agent by telephone if such communication may be helpful in the further examination of this case. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On May 16, 2006
(Date of Deposit)

Kenneth D. Labudda, Reg. No. 41,134
Name of applicant, assignee, or Registered rep.

Kenneth D. Labudda 05/16/06
Signature Date

Respectfully submitted,

Klaus Fischer, et al.

by: Kenneth D. Labudda 16 May 2006
Kenneth D. Labudda
Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 41,134
OSRAM SYLVANIA INC.
Phone: (847) 726-6448
Fax: (847) 726-6599